DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 917 PS 005 232

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Howe, Ann C. |
| TITLE | The Heman Street Preschool. Preliminary Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Syracuse Univ., N.Y. Reading and Language Arts Center. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Personnel Development. |
| PUB DATE | 71 |
| NOTE | 23p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | Children; Cognitive Processes; Cooperative Programs; *Curriculum; Educational Objectives; Graduate Students; Instructional Materials; Language Development; *Parent Participation; Play; *Preschool Programs; *Program Evaluation; Readiness; Staff Utilization; Story Telling; *Teacher Aides; Teacher Education; Team Teaching |

ABSTRACT

The Heman Street Preschool was organized to serve two main purposes: (1) T o provide a group of three- and four-year olds with a preschool experience which would increase their chances for later success in school; and (2) To train future teachers and teaching aides to work effectively in a preschool program. The program focused on four groups: the children, graduate students, prospective teaching aides, and parents of the children. Participants included the Preschool Director and Coordinator, nine graduate students, 24 aides, and 75 children. One graduate student and two teaching aides were assigned to teach each class for a period of three months. Curriculum goals were general language development, development of certain cognitive skills and school-readiness behaviors. Basic elements included in the daily program were Structures Language Program, Story Read or Told by Teacher, Teacher-Led Talk Sessions, Manipulative Cognitive Materials, Free Play, and Paints, Clay and Other Expressive Materials. Program evaluation revealed that students and aides improved their teaching and evaluative capabilities and that children improved in their ability to perform school tasks, in their language competency, and in their ability to draw. It is concluded that the Heman Street Preschool has demonstrated on e way a University and a school district can cooperate to produce a program beneficial to the children of the district, the students at the University, and members of the community served by the school . It is also concluded that a structured approach is more valuable than an unstructured one. (CK)

ED057917

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# PRELIMINARY REPORT

# THE HEMAN STREET PRESCHOOL 1970-71

Ann C. Howe
Reading and Language Arts Center
Syracuse University

The Preschool was a part of the Syracuse Laboratory for Innovators of Language-Centered Early Childhood Curricula conducted in the Heman Street School, East Syracuse, New York by the Reading and Language Arts Center of Syracuse University under provisions of a grant from the United States Office of Education, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, Early Childhood Division.

PS 005232

THE HEMAN STREET PRESCHOOL

1970-1971

Donald R. Lashinger, Project Director, EPDA

Ann Howe, Director of Preschool

Carolyne Pfeifer, Coordinator of Preschool

Graduate Students from Syracuse University Reading and Language Arts Center

Susan Bray
Linda Buettner
Bonnie Dennis
Roberta Guzzetta
John Helfeldt
Beverly Nicholls
Pearl Nutik
Emma Rembert
Marcia Snyder

Paraprofessional Teaching Aides

Dorothy Barilla
Catherine Cleary
Nancy Cramer
Helga Cummings
Shirley DeCoursey
Cynthia Garvey
Judith Gill
Bernadine Hochstuhl
Elaine Kamak
Sophie Moziak
Hazel Preston
Carolyn Scordo
Marcella Scheibel
Leona Smith
Shelley Usiatynski
Barbara Swortfiguer
Cindy Vallier
Dorothy Woyciesjes

# THE HEMAN STREET PRESCHOOL 1970-71

## PURPOSES

The Heman Street Preschool was organized to serve two main purposes: to provide a group of three- and four-year old children with a preschool experience which would increase their chances for later success in school and to train future teachers and teaching aides to work effectively in a preschool program. If these two purposes can be realized, the Preschool might then serve a third purpose; namely, as a model and source of information for teachers, parents, and administrators. Within the framework of its purposes the total program focused on four groups: the children, graduate students enrolled in Syracuse University, women of the community in training to become teaching aides, and parents of the children. The last group received least attention, due to limitations of personnel, time, and energy. The program was planned to have four components, corresponding to the four groups mentioned, but in practice the parts of the program overlapped and were interdependent.

## ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

Weikart (1) and others who have studied the effects of preschool programs have found that the organization and operational conditions of a program are more important for success than the particular curriculum used. Because we are convinced that this is so and because the EPDA Project is a training project, the total preschool program was planned to include constant supportive supervision and time for staff training, planning and evaluation.

The pattern of staffing in the preschool was unusual in that there were no experienced teachers other than the Preschool Director and Coordinator. The Preschool Director, a Syracuse University faculty member, was a full-time member of the EPDA staff; the Coordinator, an experienced nursery school teacher, was a half-time member of the Project staff. The other members of the staff were graduate students who were participants in the EPDA training program and women of the community in training to become paraprofessional teaching aides.

There were nine graduate student participants who had direct experience in the preschool during the course of the year. Five of these were in the Master's program and four were doctoral students. Two of the doctoral students did not take on teaching responsibilities but worked on special projects. All but one of these students had previous teaching experience, either as a teacher or student teacher, but none had had experience in a program for three- and four-year olds.

Twenty four women of the community, with wide variations in age, educational background and experience, entered the training program for paraprofessional teaching aides. Eighteen of them completed the program. Two of them had worked in a Head Start Program; the others had had no previous experience in a nursery school and all of them expressed uncertainty as to whether they would be able to work with young children in an educational setting.

During the summer the graduate students, along with two faculty members, planned and executed a four-week workshop for the aides. The workshop consisted of lectures, discussions, work with the materials to be used by and with the children, and 25 hours of observation and participation in a demonstration preschool classroom. When the classes began in the fall the students became preschool teachers and continued to be responsible, in part, for the training of the aides.

The Preschool occupied space in the modern wing of an older elementary school. Three carpeted, ground-floor rooms were available for the children's use. Two of these were used as classrooms; the third contained climbers, blocks, housekeeping and doll equipment, dress-up clothes, toy vehicles and a water table.

Approximately 75 children were enrolled in the Preschool. There was one class of three-year olds which met each day from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m. and three classes of four-year olds of which one met from 9:00 to 11:00 a.m. and the other two met from 12:00 noon to 2:00 p.m. Assignment to the four-year old classes was random.

One graduate student and two teaching aides were assigned to each class for a three-month period. All students and aides participated in the summer workshop. In the classrooms the graduate students and teaching aides had equal status as far as the children were concerned; all were called "teacher". In the beginning there was concern that the children might become upset when one teacher or several teachers left and others took over. In order to minimize the effect of frequent teacher turnover those who were leaving said a very brief and casual goodbye, with a promise to return to see the children from time to time. The new teachers always spent several days observing in the classroom before the previous teachers left and the children thus became acquainted with them gradually. Also, there were other adults - the Director, Coordinator, mothers, other graduate students, the school principal - who were in and out of the classroom. As a result, most of the children did not become strongly attached to any one adult, but accepted them all and called most of them "teacher".

The students and aides arrived one hour earlier than the children and remained an hour later. This allowed two hours per day for staff activities. Both the morning and the afternoon "shifts" were present each day during the hour from 11:00 to noon which made it possible to gather all the staff together when necessary. Once each week the Preschool Director and/or the Coordinator met during this hour with the aides and on another day each week a meeting was held with the graduate students. These meetings were used for discussions of general problems and possible solutions. At first most of the time was taken up with immediate problems of schedules, children's behavior, interpersonal relations, and the need for better definition of expectations and goals. As more pressing problems were resolved, this time became available for training. A free exchange of ideas and opinions was encouraged; the relations among members of the staff were open and relatively informal.

The Preschool Director and Coordinator shared responsibility for all phases of the training of the students and aides. The Coordinator supervised the morning classes; the Director supervised the afternoon classes. Either the Director or the Coordinator were in the building whenever classes were in session; often both of them were there. Thus, one of them was always available

for advice or assistance as needed. Since the hierarchy of professor-student-aide was not stressed, each person's authority rested to a considerable extent on her knowledge and competence. It was within this framework that the graduate students and aides learned to work with young children and with each other.

CURRICULUM

Much effort has been devoted in recent years to the development of curricula and curriculum materials for preschool programs. Enough evidence from the evaluation of programs using these curricula has now been accumulated to permit certain generalizations to be made. It has been found that the most successful programs are those in which definite educational objectives are established, teacher-planned activities are carried out with these objectives in view, and the outcomes of the activities are evaluated in terms of the objectives. When these criteria are met, the outcome of the program depends on the operational quality of the program rather than on the particular curriculum or activities used.

In making initial curriculum decisions in the Heman Street Preschool the following points, in addition to those mentioned above, were taken into consideration:

(1) The major purposes of the EPDA Early Childhood Project, of which the Preschool is a part, are to train teachers who can initiate and implement language-centered curricula and to develop generalizable knowledge about the implementation of such curricula. Implicit in these purposes is the assumption that the chief academic handicap of the Heman Street children is poor language development.

(2) The graduate students who would be the head teachers in the classrooms were inexperienced in preschool education and none of them would remain in the preschool for longer than three months. Nevertheless, it was thought essential that they be given the opportunity to become involved in program planning and evaluation.

(3) Most of the aides, who would carry out the program along with the graduate students, had had limited educational opportunities themselves and each of them would spend only three months in the classroom. Nevertheless, they should be involved as much as possible in planning and evaluation.

It did not seem necessary or wise (or even possible) to develop and lay out a complete curriculum to be followed. Instead, the following broad goals were set:

(1) General language development

(2) Development of certain cognitive skills

(3) Development of school-readiness behaviors

Initial objectives were set for each of the goals; the curriculm evolved through a continuous process of planning and evaluation. As the year progressed and some of the initial objectives were reached, other objectives were set within the same framework of general goals.

In order to facilitate planning and the attainment of the objectives, certain program elements were selected and a daily routine established. The program elements and the objectives of each are outlined below:

(1) Structures Language Program (Peabody Language Development Kit, Level P)
   - To build general vocabulary, cognitive vocabulary, language patterns, facility in oral communication
   - To increase attention span

(2) Story Read or Told by Teacher
   - To increase attention span, build vocabulary, develop familiarity with print
   - To increase awareness of sequence of events and of cause and effect relationships
   - To build association of reading and pleasure

(3) Teacher-Led Talk Sessions
   - To encourage free oral expression based on children's individual or group experiences, including observation of natural phenomena

(4) Manipulative Cognitive Materials
   - To develop abilities in sensory discrimination, classification, seriation, pattern recognition, number concepts
   - To build vocabulary appropriate to verbalize concepts

(5) Free Play
   - To allow children freedom of movement and free choice of activity so that they will be able to participate in a structured lesson for part of the time spent in school
   - To provide an opportunity for self-directed play which, it is hoped, will increasingly become sociodramatic

(6) Paints, Clay, Other Expressive Materials
   - To give children opportunity to become familiar with these materials and to find own ways of using them
   - To have another basis for interaction between teacher and child, including verbal interaction

These basic elements were included in each day's program, except for occasional special events which took some of the time. An example of a daily schedule is given on the following page.

## Sample Daily Schedule

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 - 9:15 | Arrival, greeting, removal of outdoor clothing<br>Songs<br>Group formation<br>(The children were divided into three groups for the language lessons. Grouping was flexible; various combinations were tried. Usually Group C was composed of children whose attention spans were too short for participation in more than one structured period. |
| 9:15 - 9:30 | Group A - Peabody Lesson<br>Group B - Story<br>Group C - Free play in Activity Room<br>(Children from both classrooms were together in the Activity Room) |
| 9:30 - 9:45 | Group A - Story<br>Group B - Peabody Lesson<br>Group C - Free Play in Activity Room |
| 9:45 - 10:05 | Groups A & B - Free Play in Activity Room<br>Group C - Peabody Lesson or Story<br>Preparation for snack |
| 10:05 - 10:15 | Snack Time |
| 10:15 - 10:50 | Use of art materials<br>Choice of Manipulative Cognitive Materials<br>(In general, children were allowed to choose among a number of materials. This period was also used as a time for teachers to work with small groups of children on particular skills. At any one time, some children would be working independently and others would be engaged in a teacher directed activity, always using manipulable materials and being asked, "Tell me what you are doing.") |
| 10:50 - 11:00 | Preparation for departure |
| 11:00 | Departure |

FS 005232

The sample schedule gives an incomplete, and possibly confusing, picture of the day. Art materials were not used every day; musical instruments were available and were sometimes used. Sometimes art activities took place in the Activity Room, and when the weather became warm, many activities were carried on outdoors. Sometimes a special "happening" took up all the time after snack. The three-year olds had the same basic schedule as the four-year olds, but their lesson periods were shorter and they had longer and more frequent periods for free play.

## PROGRAM PLANNING AND EVALUATION

The Preschool Director, Coordinator and graduate students currently working in the Preschool met for one day at the end of each month to plan the program for the following month. As indicated above, the basic elements of the program remained the same throughout the year, but there was always leeway for special projects and activities, simple observations of holidays, and for students and aides to try out their own ideas. A more important part of the planning was the effort to design a program which would enable each child to move forward toward the educational objectives which had been set. The children were constantly observed and their progress evaluated so that an effective program could be planned.

After the program for the month had been outlined in terms of goals and special activities, the students and the aides met to fill in the details, select books to be read, new songs to be learned, appropriate manipulable materials, etc. The need for variety was recognized. Often students or aides devised simple games or activities to meet a special need.

After the activities for the week had been planned, the student and aides in each room decided which of them would be responsible for each part of the program. Then the plan was entered in a notebook in which space was left for a short evaluation of each element of the program. A sample page from one of the notebooks, covering three days, is reproduced on page 7.

Note that each time block contains an activity or lesson; e.g., "#51, pts. 1 & 2" refers to Peabody Lesson Number 51, Parts 1 & 2. The next entry, (C.C.), gives the initials of the student or aide who will teach the lesson or lead the activity. These were entered in the notebook for each day of the week on the preceding Friday. The comments following Eval. were entered after the day's session and were written by the aide or student responsible for that part of the program. It is apparent that many of the comments are not useful, but others are, and by this means all teachers were forced to give some thought to what they were doing in the classroom.

| | MONDAY | TUESDAY | WEDNESDAY |
|---|---|---|---|
| GREETING | Hot Potato (song)<br>London Bridge | Rhyming Game | Muscial Shapes Game |
| PEABODY LANG. DEVELOPMENT LESSON | #51, pts. 1 & 2 (C.C.)*<br>Eval.: Children liked puppets. Made sentences well. Followed directio good. They did not all know meaning of around. | #52 (M.E.)<br>Eval.: Worked with clothing. All knew clothing well. Most knew what is expected and answered in sentences. Had better control of group than last time. | #53 (C.C.)<br>Eval.: Feeling objects, talking about soft and hard - talked in sentences. Believe they need more experience in sense of feelings. Did good in answering in sentences. Maybe we could skip some lessons & get into more complex ones. |
| STORY | Poems, rhymes-"First Poems of Childhood" (M.E.)<br>Eval.: Children liked poems. Talked about rhyming (sound alike), stories that rhyme (poems). Children said words that sound alike. Needed help to hear sounds that were alike. | Speckled Frog - story with flannel board. (C.C.)<br>Eval.: Children enjoyed dramatic part of it. | Story about shapes on flannel board. (N.C.)<br>Eval.: Some children knew all the shapes. They enjoyed handling pieces and putting on board. |
| ART | No Art. All teachers work with groups on cog. skills or other.<br>---<br>Rhyming Game (N.C.)<br>Eval.: If they got it they were good, but if they couldn't get it they lost interest quickly. | Print and Sponge Painting (N.C.)<br>3-4 at a time do one picture. Eval.: painted outdoors. Good for children. | Print and Sponge Painting (N.C.)<br>Children who did not have a turn yesterday plus those that want to do it again.<br>Eval.: Some are thinking ahead and making designs. |
| COGNITIVE SKILLS | One-to-one concept (C.C.)<br>Eval.: Children in this group did well. Some need help.<br>Name Game (M.E.)<br>Eval.: Chris, Ron L., Ron M., Timothy, Marco are still having trouble with names.<br>Color Testing (B.N.) | Rhyming Game (M.E.)<br>Eval.: One-to-one concept. (C.C.)<br>Eval.: Most did well. All had a turn. | One-to-one concept. (C.C.)<br>Eval.: Still need help when go beyond 3 or 4.<br>Spatial Relationships (M.E.) Eval.: All pretty good so far.<br>Colors with Gary, Chris, Ron, Kelly (B.N.) |
| COMMENTS | | See nurse about Kelly and Marco | |

* Letters in parentheses refer to teacher (student or aide). There was a fourth person, a student volunteer, in this room for part of the time covered.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Throughout the year, a consistenteffort was made to explain to parents the objectives, purposes, and methods of the Preschool. A presentation about the Preschool was given at the October meeting of the Parents-Teachers Organization of the Heman Street School. A video tape made in the classrooms was shown at the meeting and followed by a panel of aides who discussed what they were learning about children.

Each class had a Parents' Night later in the year. The aides gave a demonstration of materials and activities, parents were invited to discuss general problems, children's work was on display. The parents who came did discuss a number of their concerns about their own children.

Each parent was invited to spend an hour or two as an observer in her child's classroom; about half the mothers did so. Parents of children with special problems were strongly urged to come to school and observe their children in the classroom setting. Home visits were made in several cases.

All these activities, and others not mentioned, were directed toward involving the parents in the school experience of their children. The purpose was to explain what was happening in the Preschool, to make the parents feel at home in the school, and to arouse their interest in their children's education.

Smilansky (2) has written that parents of disadvantaged children tend to think of themselves as authority figures and caretakers, but not as teachers, of their children. Since aides were actually teachers in the Preschool, their role was emphasized at all meetings of the parents. It was hoped that the parents would identify with these other mothers from their community and realize that they, too, could teach their own children. On the last school day the mothers were invited to come to school to see some of the children's work. Each mother was presented with two booklets prepared by the staff, The Idea Book and The Car Book. These contained ideas for things for children to do during the summer, at home, and while riding in the car.

If time and personnel are available in the coming year, greater efforts will be made to find ways to get parents to become more active as teachers at home.

Parents of the community, including two of the women trained to be aides, are actively working to establish a day care center and have submitted papers to be incorporated as the Greater East Syracuse Day Care Center.

A film-tape presentation about the Preschool has been produced by the Project and is being made available for showing to community groups.

## TRAINING OF AIDES AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

Methods - The summer workshop provided several levels of training. The graduate students, with faculty assistance, planned the program for the workshop and conducted parts of it. This was the beginning of their training in methods of teaching and working with aides. During the workshop the faculty lectures, demonstrations, and work sessions were attended by both students and aides. Throughout the year the graduate students assumed a measure of responsibility for training aides; they were also learning along with the aides. The principal methods of training were modeling, observation by trainer followed by feedback, direct instruction in specific skills, and observation of peers.

Objectives - It was expected that both aides and students (future teachers) would become competent to carry out the following tasks:

1. Teach lessons from the Peabody Language Development Program to a small group of children.
2. Read a story to and elicit appropriate responses from a small group of children.
3. Use of manipulative cognitive materials with an individual child or small group to teach specific skills (e.g., color recognition, counting, name recognition, pattern replication, etc.)
4. Direct and supervise children in use of art materials.
5. Lead groups in songs and games.
6. Manage behavior problems in a calm, positive, non-punitive manner.
7. Lead children through the activities of the day with a minimum of verbal or other disapproval of children's behavior.
8. Use informal means to evaluate children's progress.

Additional competences were expected of the graduate students. They were expected to become competent to carry out the following additional tasks:

9. Administer and score standardized tests.
10. Plan the daily activities within the guidelines set for the program.
11. Assume some responsibility for training aides.

## PROGRAM EVALUATION

A program can be evaluated only in terms of the effects it has on the people involved. Some of the effects can be measured fairly easily, some are difficult to measure, some may be observed but not measured, and there may be others which can be neither measured nor observed immediately but are buried deep within the people themselves.

Students and Aides - Informal instruments were devised to measure progress toward competence in the first three objectives listed above. These instruments are given in Appendix A. These devices were not used on a pretest, post-test basis but as aids for formative evaluation and training.

Progress toward Objectives 4 and 5 was assessed by the Director and Coordinator through direct observation of the aides and students at work in the classroom. At the end of the training period the aides could list, from memory, an average of 21 songs and finger plays and 8 types of art material which they felt competent to teach.

Attainment of Objectives 6 and 7 was measured by use of an observational

instrument, developed with the help of Mr. John Dopyera, for use in this program. It was developed during the time the first group of aides was working in the classroom and administered to the second and third group of aides at the beginning and end of their respective periods of classroom service. This instrument measured the number of times each subject sanctioned the behavior of each child during a total of sixty minutes, observed in five-minute segments. The behavior being sanctioned was classified as congruent or incongruent with the expectations of the adult and the type of behavior was categorized as achievement, involvement, peer harm, property harm, etc. The analysis of the data obtained by use of this instrument indicated that all the aides showed disapproval of children's behavior less often at the end of the training than at the beginning. This instrument and the results obtained are described in Appendix B.

Use of informal measures to evaluate children's progress (Objective 8) was part of the daily routine of the Preschool. Multiple copies of each class list were provided to facilitate assessment along many dimensions. A number of informal instruments were devised, three of which are given in Appendix C. The particular devices used in this program are given only as illustrative examples of simple, easily constructed measures which focus attention on the program objectives in terms of individual progress toward those goals.

In addition to these methods of assessment, a folder was kept for each child. Progress in language development and socialization, or apparent lack of it, was noted at least once a week in each child's folder. Each student and aide assumed responsibility for writing in the folders of six or seven children per week; the following week folders were exchanged and each teacher had a different set of children. Several purposes were served by having these anecdotal records kept. First, and most important, the adults were forced to focus attention on individual children in order "to have something to write." Second, the students and aides were made aware, when they saw what others had written in the folders, that their own assessment of a child sometimes differed from the assessment of another adult in the room. Third, the folders were passed on to each incoming group of students and aides to help them become acquainted with the children.

Each student and aide was evaluated on her knowledge and her ability to evaluate individual children in the following way: three names were chosen at random and the student or aide was asked to evaluate the three children on four elements of the program (Peabody Language Program, cognitive skills, general language ability, and level of play), without access to the children's records or folders. These evaluations were then compared with the children's records and scored on a three-point scale.

To meet Objective 9, the graduate students had training and experience in the use of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the classroom observational instrument mentioned above; several students observed the administration and scoring of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities; others used and scored the Stauffer measure of general language ability.

Students were required to plan the daily classroom activities for two weeks in advance; their plans were studied by the Director and Coordinator and then discussed with the students. No formal means were devised for measuring the attainment of Objective 8, but all students were able to make acceptable

plans by the end of the training.

Some students assumed responsibility for training aides with self-confidence and considerable competence; others found it more difficult. They evaluated the aides on an Evaluation Form, discussed weaknesses and strengths with individual aides, and served as models in areas of their own strength. In some cases students learned more from aides than aides learned from them.

At the end of their time in the classroom the aides were asked to comment in writing on the strengths and weaknesses of their training program from their points of view and on any changes which had occurred in their own attitudes or feelings. The greatest weakness and the greatest strength, as perceived by the aides, were two sides of the same coin; on one hand they thought the greatest weakness was that they had not had enough training in the skills needed and, on the other hand, they saw the greatest strength as the instruction and help which they had received. Also frequently mentioned as a strength was the rapport among members of the staff and the mutual help and encouragement found within the group. The change most frequently noticed in their own attitudes was in their relations with their own children at home; many of them mentioned that they now understood their own children better, had more patience, had more realistic expectations, and were trying out at home things learned at school. One of the women in the program has now enrolled as a student in the down-town division of Syracuse University and seriously hopes to become a teacher. Two of the women have gone out into the community to start a day care center. Their efforts have resulted in the formation of a board of directors which is now taking legal steps to have the proposed East Syracuse Day Care Center become incorporated.

When students were asked to write anonymously what they liked best about the program, they all listed their work with the aides and the opportunity to have real responsibility in the classroom. The most persistent criticism was directed toward what they felt to be a lack of definition and clarity in what was expected of them. It is hoped that in the coming year (1971-72) the expectations for students can be defined and clarified in a way which will be more satisfactory for students but will still allow for individual differences of background and talent.

Children - The children who were in the Preschool during the past year will be followed as they move through the kindergarten and first two grades of Heman Street School. Their performance in the school will be the best, though not the only, indicator of the final success or failure of the EPDA Project. Since the community is a stable one, many of the children in the Preschool have siblings in the grades above them; some are children of former Heman Street students. It seems reasonable to assume that the future performance of the children who will enter kindergarten this fall (i.e., the children who have been in the Preschool) would not be significantly different from that of previous groups unless significant differences had been made in the educational program. This group of children might be expected to reach the same average achievement levels as previous groups in the school. There would be individual differences, of course, but the performance levels have remained relatively constant for a number of years and there would be no reason to believe that the levels would change unless changes were made in the educational program and process of the school. The EPDA Project personnel,

by establishing a Preschool and working to stimulate and assist teachers, are attempting to make significant changes in the total educational program of the school. If this effort is successful, the achievement levels of the children will rise. The group of children for whom the expectation is greatest is the population enrolled in the Preschool during the past year, since intervention began at an earlier age for them.

It is still too early to evaluate this Project in terms of the achievement levels of the children, but several facets of the program have been evaluated by formal and informal means. The mental growth of the children was assessed by the use of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, a Language Competency Test, and the Draw-A-Person Test. We do not attach a great deal of importance to the results obtained with any of these instruments alone, but we have been encouraged to note that the pre- and post-test scores from all three instruments indicated somewhat more growth than might have been expected fro the passage of the elapsed time. The methods and results are described below.

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test was administered to the children in February (Form B) and again in May (Form A). There were 61 children from whom both scores were obtained; there were 12 others who were present for only one testing. The scores of the latter were not used in the calculations which produced the results given in Table I.

TABLE I

| | 3-Year Olds | | 4-Year Olds | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Feb. | May | Feb. | May |
| N | 13 | 13 | 48 | 48 |
| Mean | 99.5 | 103.8 | 99.5 | 104.3 |
| S.D. | 16.4 | 10.5 | 14.1 | 12.1 |

Although the first administration of the test took place halfway through the year, there was a gain in mean score for both the three-year olds and the four-year olds.

It seems of more interest and significance that there were 3 three-year olds and 9 four-year olds who had scores below 85 in February; in May this number had been reduced to 1 three-year old and 3 four-year olds. The significance of this difference lies partly in the use to which these scores may be put. In some school districts children with low scores are put in special classes or tracks; if the score is a realistic reflection of the child's ability, such placement may benefit the child. However, if the score is not a good measure of the child's ability to do school tasks, placement in with a low-scoring group can adversely affect the child's future in school.

It is also of interest that the mean scores are very close to 100. This leads one to believe that the children come to school without massive intellectual deficits (at least, without deficits which can be measured with this test) and makes more insistent the question "Why don't they succeed in school?"

Language Competency Test

The general language ability of the children was assessed with an informal measure described by Stauffer (3). The examiner presented the child with a picture and said, "Here is a picture. Tell me the story you see in the picture." If this elicited no response, the examiner said, "Tell me what you see in the picture." Each child was asked to perform this task for two pictures. The responses were recorded, transcribed, and scored independently by two scorers. The scoring was on a 4-point scale according to stated criteria (see Appendix D). Language samples were obtained from children in two classes of four-year olds in October and again in June. There were 27 children from whom both samples were obtained. Scores of children from whom only one sample was obtained are not included in the tabulations below.

Table II gives the number of children at each level for Pretest (October) and Post-test (June). The data is given in more detail in Table III which shows the number of children from each Pretest (October) level who attained each Post-test (June) level.

Table II

| Level | Pretest | Post-test |
|---|---|---|
| I | 10 | 1 |
| II | 8 | 6 |
| III | 5 | 13 |
| IV | 4 | 7 |

Table III

| Pretest Level | Post-test Level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I | II | III | IV |
| I | 1 | 4 | 5 | |
| II | | 2 | 6 | |
| III | | | 1 | 4 |
| IV | | | 1 | 3 |

It can be seen from Table II that of the children at Level I - III in October there were only 4 who did not move to a higher level by June. One of the children who scored at Level IV on the Pretest moved back to Level III; the others at Level IV on the Pretest were already at the highest level measured and any further growth could not be measured by this instrument.

Draw-A-Person Test

During the second week of school in September a sample of children from each class were given a large piece of paper and a crayon and asked to draw a person. This procedure was repeated during the last week of school. The drawings were scored by two independent scorers using the criteria given in Appendix E. In this system a score gain of 3 points is equivalent to a gain of nine months in mental age. Therefore, an average gain of three points might be expected over a nine-month period such as that from September to June. TableIV shows that both the three- and four-year olds showed slightly greater gains than might be expected on the basis of the expectation of normal growth for a nine-month period.

Table IV

| | 3 year olds | 4 year olds |
|---|---|---|
| N | 13 | 31 |
| mean gain-score | 4.2 | 3.8 |
| mean gain-months | 13 | 11 |

At the beginning of the year there were 7 three-year olds and 6 four-year olds in the sample whose drawings showed no recognizable elements of a man. At the end of the year there were only 2 children (one three-year old and one four-year old) whose drawings could not be scored. The general impression gained from this and other test score data is that the program was of most benefit to the children who scored lowest on the various measures at entry into the program.

CONCLUSION

The Heman Street Preschool has demonstrated one way that a University and a school district can cooperate to produce a program which is beneficial to the children of the district, the students at the university, and members of the community served by the school.

In the coming year (1971-72) six of the aides who were trained in the program will be hired to work half time and there will be a new group of graduate students entering the program. In-service training for students and aides will continue but the decreased emphasis on aide training will allow more time for focusing on objectives and outcomes. We hope to be able to identify objectives and measure outcomes with more precision. We shall continue to seek ways to understand better the specific educational needs of the children and to find ways to meet the needs.

We remain convinced that a structured program, with some of the teacher's time devoted to active teaching, will produce more desired outcomes than a completely un-structured approach.

## Appendix A

### Informal Measuring Devices

B. Aides and Student-Teachers (to be marked by observer)

a) Peabody Language Development Lesson

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Familiarity with lesson | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Preparation of Materials | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Gets interest of____children | All | Most | Few |
| Maintains interest of____children | All | Most | Few |
| Correct level of response from____children | All | Most | Few |
| Recognizes responses | Always | Sometimes | Never |
| Number of interruptions for discipline____ | | | |

b) Story

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gains attention of____children | All | Most | Few |
| Holds attention of____children | All | Most | Few |
| Elicits response from____children | All | Most | Few |
| Level of response of children | High | Medium | Low |
| Recognizes responses | Always | Sometimes | Never |
| Number of interruptions for discipline____ | | | |

c) Cognitive Task Materials or Art

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Involved with children | Always | Sometimes | Never |
| Familiarity with materials | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Elicits children's explanations | Always | Sometimes | Never |
| Reinforces task completion | Always | Sometimes | Never |
| Maintains interest of____children | All | Most | Few |
| Answers questions | Always | Sometimes | Never |
| Number of interruptions for discipline____ | | | |

## Appendix B

### Observation of Sanctioning Behavior of Aides

Rationale - Informal observation of the paraprofessional aides as they began working in the classroom with children showed them to be somewhat overprotective, much concerned with maintaining what they considered to be proper school behavior, and anxious not to let a child "get away with anything". We had placed much stress on teaching them to teach the children various language and cognitive skills but we felt that the atmosphere in the classroom needed to be more relaxed and free from scolding, blaming, and threats of punishment. We asked Mr. John Dopyera, who had had experience in evaluating Head Start programs, to help us develop an instrument which would measure the amount and kind of this type of behavior on the part of the aides.

An instrument was developed which measures the number of times during a given time period that an aide (or any adult) overtly sanctions a child's behavior. The instrument was developed during the time the first group of aides were being trained. It was subsequently administered at the beginning and end of the training periods of the second and third group of aides. In addition to its use as a pre- and post-training measure, it was also used to train the student-participants in the use of an observational instrument.

The Instrument - The instrument is a compilation of the sanctions applied by one aide over a given period to each child with whom she or he interacts. The observations are made in 5-minute segments by one observer. A notation is made for each sanction which indicates the recipient (the child), type of behavior, and whether the behavior was congruent or incongruent with the expectations of the person sanctioning. The categories of behavior which were used are as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| achievement (task completion) | being orderly |
| involvement in task | being in proper place (location) |
| talking | maintaining correct posture |
| making noise | timing of activity |
| inflicting harm to self | observing social amenities |
| inflicting harm to peer | keeping property in location |
| cooperation | damaging property |

Observation sheets were constructed for each class with the names of all children in the class on the sheet. When it was possible to do so, each aide was observed for a total of 80 minutes in 5-minute segments over a period of several days while engaged in all the activities on the schedule. In some cases the observations totaled 60 minutes, which is the minimum considered to be adequate.

Results - The initial data analysis has been completed to show comparisons between total number of sanctions administered before and after training. The table below gives the results for the ten aides who were present for both pre and post observations.

Appendix B (continued)

Sanctions Administered by Aides. Pre and Post Observations and Differences

| Subjects | Sanctions per 60-Minute Period | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Incongruent | | | Congruent | | |
| | Pre | Post | Diff | Pre | Post | Diff |
| 1. D.B. | 121 | 73 | -48 | 17 | 15 | -2 |
| 2. N.C. | 117 | 72 | -45 | 27 | 23 | -4 |
| 3. S.D. | 164 | 116 | -48 | 30 | 33 | +3 |
| 4. M.S. | 83 | 66 | -17 | 28 | 20 | -8 |
| 5. B.S. | 111 | 80 | -31 | 22 | 13 | -9 |
| 6. C.V. | 127 | 104 | -23 | 34 | 39 | +5 |
| 7. D.W. | 104 | 61 | -43 | 15 | 21 | +6 |
| 8. S.U. | 61 | 54 | -7 | 19 | 16 | -3 |
| 9. S.M. | 140 | 56 | -84 | 27 | 15 | -12 |
| 10.K.C. | 130 | 58 | -72 | 40 | 17 | -23 |

It can be seen that there was a decrease in sanctions administered for incongruent behavior in all cases. This is in line with the objectives of the training program. It is not shown in the table but can be seen from the raw data that the greatest number of sanctions were given in the categories of achievement and involvement. This is probably a result of the emphasis on increasing involvement and achievement in learning tasks in the program.

## Appendix C

### Informal Measuring Devices

A. Children (to be marked by teachers)

Directions: Mark each child once each day. Mark on the basis of actual performance for that day. That is, mark according to what occurred while you were watching, not what you think the child is capable of, or how he performed earlier. If a child's performance for one day is below his usual performance, this will be shown by the level of his performance on other days when he is observed.

a) Children's Performance Level on Peabody Lesson
   0 - Does not respond
   1 - Responds at level lower than expected
   2 - Responds at expected level when prompted
   3 - Responds with ease at expected level

b) Play level in Activity Room
   0 - wandering
   1 - playing alone
   2 - watching
   3 - parallel play
   4 - associative play

c) Children's Use of Manipulative Materials
   0 - wanders
   1 - uses materials only with urging
   2 - selects material, uses briefly, leaves
   3 - selects material, completes task

## Appendix D

### Scoring Procedures for Language Competency Test

Level I:
a. names items in pictures.
b. may require teacher prompting.

Level II:
a. uses simple sentences.
b. expresses self in "I" manner: "I see a house."

Level III:
a. responds to main action depicted.
b. notices other elements in scene but does not relate them to main action.
c. uses descriptive words.
d. adds own relevant ideas.

Level IV:
a. forms a story by relating picture elements and projecting ideas creatively.
b. notes antecedent action and senses future consequences.

## Appendix E

Scoring System for Draw-A-Person Test

1 point for each of following:

1. Head present
2. Legs present
3. Arms present
4. a. Trunk present
4. b. Trunk proportion
4. c. Shoulders present
5. a. Attachment of limbs (A)
5. b. Attachment of limbs (B)
6. a. Neck present
6. b. Neck outline
7. a. Eyes present
7. b. Nose present
7. c. Mouth present
7. d. Features in two dimensions
7. e. Nostrils shown
8. a. Hair present
8. b. Hair detail
9. a. Clothing present
9. b. Two articles non-transparent
9. c. Entirely non-transparent
9. d. Four articles shown
9. e. Complete costume
10. a. Fingers present
10. b. Number correct
10. c. Detail correct
10. d. Thumb shown
10. e. Hand shown
11. a. Arm joints
11. b. Leg Joints

Table of Mental Age Equivalents of Scores

| Score | M.A. | Score | M.A. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3-3 | 14 | 6-6 |
| 2 | 3-6 | 15 | 6-9 |
| 3 | 3-9 | 16 | 7-0 |
| 4 | 4-0 | 17 | 7-3 |
| 5 | 4-3 | 18 | 7-6 |
| 6 | 4-6 | 19 | 7-9 |
| 7 | 4-9 | 20 | 8-0 |
| 8 | 5-0 | 21 | 8-3 |
| 9 | 5-3 | 22 | 8-6 |
| 10 | 5-6 | 23 | 8-9 |
| 11 | 5-9 | 24 | 9-0 |
| 12 | 6-0 | 25 | 9-3 |
| 13 | 6-3 | 26 | 9-6 |

References

1. Weikart, D. Ypsilanti Preschool Curriculum Demonstration Project, High-Scope Educational Research Foundation, Ypsilanti, Michigan, 1969.

2. Smilansky, Sara. The Effects of Sociodramatic Play on Disadvantaged Pre-School Children, Jon Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York 1968.

3. Stauffer, Russell G. Directing Reading Maturity as a Cognitive Process, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.